

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

Gregory P. Sloan,]
]
Plaintiff,]
]
vs.]
]
L.G. Philips LCD Co., Ltd.,]
L. G. Philips LCD America, Inc.,]
Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.,]
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.,]
NEC Corp., NEC Display Solutions]
of America, Inc., NEC LCD]
Technologies, Ltd., NEC]
Electronics America, Inc.,]
Sharp Corp., Sharp Electronics Corp.,]
AU Optronics Corp., AU Optronics]
Corporation America, Chi Mei]
Optoelectronics Corp., Chi Mei]
Optoelectronics USA, Inc.,]
International Display]
Technology Co., Ltd., International]
Display Technology USA, Inc.,]
Hitachi Ltd., Hitachi America Ltd.,]
Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc.,]
Hitachi Displays, Ltd., Toshiba Corp.,]
Toshiba Matsushita Display]
Technology Co., Ltd.,]
Chunghwa Picture Tubes Ltd.,]
Hannstar Display Corp.,]
IDT International Ltd.,]
Oregon Scientific, Inc., and]
Sanyo Epson Imaging Devices Corp.]
]
Defendants.]

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO LOCAL RULE 26.01 INTERROGATORIES

Interrogatory: (A) State the full name, address, and telephone number of all persons or legal entities who may have a subrogation interest in each claim and state the basis and extent of said interest.

Answer: None

Interrogatory: (B) As to each claim, state whether it should be tried jury or nonjury and why.

Answer: All antitrust claims against Defendant are legal claims and should be tried by a Jury pursuant to the Plaintiff's Jury Trial Demand. Claims for unjust enrichment and injunctive relief are equitable and should be tried nonjury.

Interrogatory: (C) State whether the party submitting these responses is a publicly owned company and separately identify: (1) each publicly owned company of which it is a parent, subsidiary, partner, or affiliate; (2) each publicly owned company which owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares or other indicia of ownership of the party; and (3) each publicly owned company in which the party owns ten percent or more of the outstanding shares.

Answer: Plaintiff is an Individual.

Interrogatory: (D) State the basis for asserting the claim in the division in which it was filed (or the basis of any challenge to the appropriateness of the division).

Answer: A substantial portion of the events giving rise to this claim occurred in this division.

Interrogatory: (E) Is this action related in whole or in part to any other matter filed in this District, whether civil or criminal? If so, provide: (1) a short caption and the full case number of the related action; (2) an explanation of how the matters

are related; and (3) a statement of the status of the related action. Counsel should disclose any cases which *may be* related regardless of whether they are still pending. Whether cases *are* related such that they should be assigned to a single judge will be determined by the Clerk of Court based on a determination of whether the cases: arise from the same or identical transactions, happenings, or events; involve the identical parties or property; or for any other reason would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

Answer: No related claims. However, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation heard a motion to consolidate similar cases. No ruling has been made on that motion.

Dated: April 4, 2007

Strom Law Firm, LLC

s/ J. Preston Strom, Jr.
J. Preston Strom, Jr.
Fed. I.D. No. 4354
Mario A. Pacella
Fed. I.D. No. 7538
2110 Beltline Boulevard, Suite A
Columbia, SC 29204
Telephone: (803) 252-4800
Fax: (803) 252-4801

Gergel, Nickles & Solomon, P.A.
Carl L. Solomon
Post Office Box 1866
1519 Richland Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
Telephone: (803) 779-8080

Whatley Drake & Kallas
Joe R. Whatley, Jr.
1540 Broadway, 37th Floor

New York, New York 35203
Telephone: (212) 447-7070